

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 560

UD 026 650

TITLE Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student:
Conference Report and Recommendations.

INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. City Coll.; New York
State Education Dept., Albany.

PUB DATE 1 Jun 88

NOTE 21p.

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Attendance; College School Cooperation; *Cooperative
Programs; *Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs;
Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement;
*High Risk Students; High Schools; *High School
Students; Parent Participation; School Business
Relationship; School Community Relationship; School
Holding Power; Secondary Schools; Self Concept;
Social Services; Urban Programs; Urban Schools; Urban
Youth

IDENTIFIERS *Attendance Improvement Plan; *Dropout Prevention
Program

ABSTRACT

The second annual Staying-in-School-Partnership Program (SSPP) conference, "Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student: Ideas for Practitioners," brought representatives from the ten SSPP programs together with representatives from New York State and New York City Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AIDP) programs, the New York City Dropout Prevention Program (DPP), and the Alternative High School Programs of the New York City Board of Education. SSPP's are university-based collaborative programs designed to work with schools to meet the needs of at-risk students. Goals were to report on successful practices, and to identify and recommend changes in schools that would improve education for at-risk students. Areas for school improvement included the following: (1) school organization and social services; (2) social climate and affective needs; (3) curriculum and instruction; (4) staff development; (5) parent involvement; and (6) partnerships with business and community-based organizations. Contents of this report are the following: (1) a list of 18 recommendations for how schools need to be changed to improve education for at-risk students developed by the participants; (2) the full text of the keynote address: "Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student" (S. Phillips); (3) the conference program; (4) a list of the conference participants; and (5) acknowledgments of conference staff. (FMW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED303560

SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING FOR THE AT-RISK STUDENT

CONFERENCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert M. Trumbly
NYS Education Dep.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sponsored by

The New York State Education Department
Office of Higher and Continuing Education
Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration
and

The City College of the City University of New York



The City College of the City University of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

UD 026 650

SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING FOR THE AT-RISK STUDENT

CONFERENCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*The City College
June 1988*

**Sponsored by
The New York State Education Department
Office of Higher and Continuing Education
Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration
and
The City College of the City University of New York**

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

MARTIN C. BARELL, <i>Chancellor</i> , B.A., I.A., LL.B.	Muttontown
R. CARLOS CARBALLADA, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , B.S.	Rochester
WILLARD A. GENRICH, LL.B.	Buffalo
EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D.	Rome
JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D.	Bronx
LAURA BRADLEY CHODOS, B.A., M.A.	Vischer Ferry
LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Bayside
J. EDWARD MEYER, B.A., LL.B.	Chappaqua
FLOYD S. LINTON, A.B., M.A., M.P.A.	Miller Place
MIMI LEVIN LIEBER, B.A., M.A.	Manhattan
SHIRLEY C. BROWN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany
NORMA GLUCK, B.A., M.S.W.	Manhattan
JAMES W. MCCABE, SR., A.B., M.A.	Johnson City
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, B.A., M.A., P.D.	Hollis
WALTER COOPER, B.A., Ph.D.	Rochester
GERALD J. LUSTIG, B.A., M.D.	Staten Island

President of The University and Commissioner of Education

THOMAS SOBOL

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education

THOMAS E. SHELDON

Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Continuing Education

DONALD J. NOLAN

Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education Services

MIKE VAN RYN

Director, Division of Postsecondary Equity and Access Programs

JEANINE L. GRINAGE

Chief, Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration

CHARLES F. GRABER

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, or sex in the educational programs and activities which it operates. Inquiries concerning this policy of equal opportunity and affirmative action should be referred to the Department's Affirmative Action Officer, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234. Phone (518) 474-1265.

Introduction

On June 1st and 2nd, 1988 the second annual Stay-in-School-Partnership Program (SSPP) Conference was held at The City College of New York. The conference, entitled **"Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student: Ideas for Practitioners"**, was sponsored by the Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration of the New York State Education Department and The City College of New York. The first day of the conference brought together representatives from the ten SSPP projects (university-based collaborative programs designed to work with schools to meet the needs of at-risk students) to report on their projects.

On the second day, the ten SSPP projects were joined by representatives from State and City Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AIDP) programs, the New York City Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) and the Alternative High School Programs of the New York City Board of Education. The goal of the second day was to identify and recommend changes in schools that would improve education for at-risk students. Those recommendations, developed by Conference participants, are included in this report.

Following a welcome from Rebecca Kennard, Supervisor, Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration, who moderated the session, Leonard Beckum, Dean of the School of Education, The City College welcomed participants on behalf of President Bernard Harleston. Assistant Commissioner of Higher Education Services Mike Van Ryn extended welcoming remarks on behalf of Deputy Commissioner of Higher and Continuing Education Donald Nolan, the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Education Thomas Sobol. The keynote address, reproduced in full in this report, was presented by Stephen Phillips, Superintendent, Alternative High Schools and Programs of the New York City Board of Education. Representatives from the several programs were then asked to briefly share successful practices in each of six strand areas. These strands were to explore improved schooling through enhanced school organization and social services, school climate and affective needs, curriculum and instruction, staff development, parent involvement, and partnerships with businesses and community-based organizations.

Following the presentations, working groups in each strand area were asked to formulate recommendations for how schools need to be changed in order to improve education for at-risk youth. These recommendations are particularly valuable because they come from practitioners who, by virtue of having worked in special programs for at-risk youth, have acquired considerable expertise. The recommendations were synthesized by the strand leaders and responded to at the end of the day by a distinguished panel that included Regent Norma Gluck, Victor Herbert, Executive Director, Division of High Schools, Marcia Shelton-Brevot, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent of Alternative High Schools and Programs, and Bernard Wolinez, Chief Administrator, Office of High Schools Support Services.

Following the conference, the recommendations were edited, reclustered, and further synthesized. Some of the recommendations were omitted in order to enhance the coherence and consistency of the overall document. Because there was considerable overlap from strand to strand, the recommendations are presented across strands.

One of the conference participants said it best when he noted that schools will have to take risks if schooling for at-risk youth is to be improved. There is little doubt that meaningful change cannot occur without such risk-taking. It is our hope that these recommendations not only stimulate further thought about the kinds of changes that are needed to improve education for at-risk youth, but that they serve as the basis for action.



Charles F. Graber, Chief
Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration
State Education Department



Norman Shapiro
Professor of Education
The City College

Recommendations

1. Permit School-Based Decision Making

If students are going to be retained in schools, schools must do a better job of meeting their needs. **The changes that schools must make, however, should be determined by the schools themselves.** School-based planning and decision making and school-based change were themes that were repeated in almost all of the strand areas.

Schools recognize the need to provide more services, and are asking for the autonomy to decide how those services can best be delivered. Schools also recognize the need for structural change, but this too needs to be determined on a school-by-school basis. Schools should have their own budgets and decide how to allocate their resources. One recommendation suggested that planning must not only be school-based but in partnership with the community.

2. Expand School Operations

There were a number of recommendations about the specific ways in which schools need to change to better meet the needs of at-risk students. **Schools must remain open longer and be available at times that are more convenient for students and community.** They need to have year round programs in order to create more consistency and continuity. In addition, make expanded use of school buildings with before/after school activities. Such activities should be academic and recreational; provide credit bearing/tutorial learning situations; include vocational and career training and incorporate other community organizations into the school. Cooperative programs, in which students alternate work and school, should be made more available.

Schools should also be places where students and their families can have more than their educational needs attended to. **Comprehensive social service, health and day care should be more readily available in schools.** Place a Human Resources Agency representative on-site in every school. Resources and programs, to be effective, must be on-site.

3. Improve Coordination of Services

Within schools, districts and the State as a whole, the coordination of services could be greatly improved. Duplication of efforts is common. There may be many ser-



vices available to the at-risk student that don't reach the student because of poor coordination. A detailed analysis of the degree of service duplication, availability of services and coverage for each individual student is needed.

Bring together all of the services within the school. Someone must be available who can coordinate the various programs and resources. There needs to be a focus on comprehensive planning for each individual child by bringing together social and academic resources.

There is also a need for greater **information sharing** within and between schools and a need to end feelings of isolation among schools. More resource networks are needed so schools can communicate about what is available and what works. There needs to be better articulation between elementary, junior high and high schools to identify the "at-risk" population earlier and provide them services sooner.

4. Organize Schools Into Smaller Units

It is clear that students and staff alike suffer from the anonymity of large schools and large school systems. **If schools are to be humanized they must be organized into smaller units and within those units, still smaller units must be created** for delivery of services and instruction. This regrouping will allow **teachers to get in touch with students and students to get in touch with teachers.** Avoid tracking, streaming or segregation. Consideration should also be given to modifying the departmentalized approach which fosters anonymity. Students might be

better served by having many classes with the same cohort and having a team of teachers. Perhaps students could have fewer teachers for longer periods of time.

Mini-courses can be arranged to be completed in a shorter span of time or in segments that can be completed at a later time to accommodate students whose schedules are interrupted by absence.

Reduced class size is especially important in working with at-risk students. (Smaller, here too, is better). This permits greater attention to the learning problems each student is having and provides greater opportunity to individualize instruction.

5. Bring Teachers and Students Closer Together

Teachers and students need more occasions when they can relate to each other as people. Large anonymous institutions often create climates that alienate students. Teachers need to have the opportunity to **mentor, coach and/or tutor students** and such activities should be part of their schedules. This is especially important for entering high school freshmen. Each freshman should have an orientation during which time student and teacher-mentor discuss and set educational goals and objectives. **Teachers need office hours (and offices!) for mentoring, advising and tutoring.**

6. Humanize the Schools

Make schools more **welcoming places** with more activities for students, parents and community. Improve opportunities for **personal contact** between teachers and students. Promote and encourage a belief system that views at-risk students as reputable learners. Develop and implement house plans, family groups and provide ample staff time and resources to make them effective.

Give all members of the school community a greater say in decision making. Schools should model democratic structures that respect diverse expressions of opinion. **Students, as well as all staff, need to be empowered** if they are to be agents of change in improving their own education and if they are to be successful in setting and meeting educational goals. Empowerment of students will draw them into the educational process where they have been left out. **Involving students in the decisions which affect school life will help to strengthen their commitment to school.** Pupils will gain a sense of power and control through a greater say in determining school and classroom rules and procedures.

Schools, even high schools, need to be concerned with more than the academic needs of students. They need to find ways of strengthening values, mediating conflicts, promoting positive attitudes, enhancing leadership and developing character.

7. Identify Problems and Intervene Earlier

Factors that put students at-risk of dropping out of school are often present long before they get to high school. We need to **identify potential problems early** and start providing services at the level where problems are first spotted. This requires more support at the elementary and middle school level.

8. Foster School-Based and Flexible Curriculum

Curriculum which has been mandated by states has not always been effective. If we are to break the cycle of failure, we need the leeway to experiment. Schools need to determine, on a case-by-case basis, what students need. **Curriculum and instruction should be school-based.** There should be more input into State mandates by the schools. Teachers ought to have more input and control over curriculum and instruction. There need to be alternative ways of achieving the aims and objectives of the curriculum.

Schools need to have greater **flexibility to juggle requirements.** They also need greater latitude in awarding credit. Award credit for that work which is traditionally unacknowledged. Break credits into smaller bits. For example, in a six-week time frame a student could earn a third or a quarter credit for work completed.

If curriculum and instruction can become determined by the school then perhaps **evaluation too should be more school-based.** State and local examinations and attendance criteria do not always measure successes schools are having with the most at-risk students. There also need to be alternatives to State mandated exams (e.g., submitting a student's portfolio already judged by teachers as outstanding in lieu of taking the Reading Competency Test).





9. Foster A Learner-Centered and Affirming Curriculum

It is not possible to meet the needs of learners until we are familiar with who the learners are. Once there is a better and more sympathetic understanding of the student, schools need to have leeway in choosing the means to respond to their learners' needs. Curriculum should be slanted to the students' needs and interests. The relevance and importance of the material to be learned should be apparent to the learner. Curriculum must also be affirming of the learner and should assist in building self-esteem.

As schools begin to respond to the concept of student as a whole person, incorporating into their function some social services, so teachers must begin to integrate the whole person into the curriculum. This may ameliorate alienation that plagues students and teachers in schools, and which may lead to a loss of faith in schools' worthiness. Teachers need time for discussion with the students they work with, as well as time to discuss those students with other teachers.

10. Create Learning Communities

Not only do schools need to create a greater overall sense of community, schools should also try to create communities of learners. Rather than the usual structure where teachers lecture and students listen (or don't), teachers and students should see each other as part of this community and as **cointentional learners**. Classroom communities can also serve to effectively undercut alienation and give purpose to learning. In some instances this may best be achieved through team teaching, and opportunities for that should be enhanced. Part of the responsibility of the learning community in dealing with the whole student might be to **give teachers some of the counseling responsibilities** for their students.

11. Connect Students to the Community

Connect students with their community through participation in special **community outreach activities** (parks, nursing homes, tutoring, shelters, etc.) This may help everyone, teachers, students and community, make an effective social connection and raise students' awareness that they can make a difference. It should also enhance students' sense of responsibility.

12. Empower School Staff

Schools need to be restructured to give teachers and other school staff a say in school decision making. A comprehensive School Task Force made up of school personnel should be formed in each school. Principals need to actively embrace teacher/staff empowerment. **Restructure schools to support staff empowerment.** Faculty committees (curriculum, educational policy, personnel, etc.) should be established. Teachers, guidance counselors and other school staff should be involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of in-school programs with adequate funding and administrative support. They should also participate in the selection of the principal, other supervisory staff and their peers.

13. Provide Greater Support for School Staff

Teaching loads need to be reduced. Teachers who teach five classes of 35 students each are responsible for 175 students. With numbers as high as this it is often impossible to do anything more than process students through school. Teachers need time to meet students, mentor and coach them. They also need more time for preparation. This is especially important for teachers who work with the most at-risk students.

14. Extend and Improve Staff Development

Staff who work with the most at-risk students are in particular need of staff development opportunities. Without them they will replicate the same strategies in the classroom that may have contributed to students being at-risk in the first place. Additional resources, time and space need to be allocated to this end.

Staff development needs to be regarded as being more than a day during which "staff development" occurs. Ongoing learning has to be more significant than it currently is. Too many staff development activities are poorly conceived and poorly instituted and the lack of change in practice reflects that. One way to improve this is to involve teachers in planning for, implementing and evaluating the impact of their own development.

Colleges and universities can play an important role both in preservice and inservice teacher education. Their programs, however, should be school-based. They should be collaboratively planned and implemented, and their outcomes should result in real changes in schools. Colleges and universities should work cooperatively with schools on the improvement of education.



15. Renew the Commitment to Parent Involvement

Schools must genuinely desire to involve parents and not simply pay lip service to the concept of parental involvement. There are many who believe that parent involvement is either not needed or an impediment to efficient school functioning. There are others who view parent involvement as having a few parents represented on a parents' association. These attitudes may derive from a limited sense of how to most effectively involve parents and a limited understanding of its possible advantages.

To effectively plan for parent involvement it becomes critical for schools to begin to engage in **real dialogue** with parents, to listen to their needs and concerns and to



have the resources to be able to respond to them. It will also require a **redefinition of what parent involvement means**. It is not sufficient to tell schools that they must have parent involvement; they will need to be assisted in the process. Planning and developing such programs will require technical support and staff development. There needs to be a systematic approach to parent support in each school's program.

Alternative ways of involving parents needs to be found and tried. It therefore becomes important to reexamine the concept of parent involvement and the way it is typically defined. Even the term itself must be questioned, since it presumes that "we want them (the parents) to be involved in our school." Perhaps instead, we need to think in terms of **schools that reach out to parents and community**. Schools might become the focus for community services or might take educational programs off-site and into other buildings in the community.

16. Provide More Services to Parents

There were many recommendations concerning the need to provide a far greater range of services to parents, from simply a warm welcome when they enter the school, to satisfying some of their social and learning needs. Parent participation is greatest when parents perceive the purpose of their visit as addressing their perceived needs. This can serve to build greater participation in other areas.

Schools should consider creating **parent centers** that would have flexible hours and allow parents to participate at their convenience. Such centers could help parents negotiate the school system, provide other social services, serve as the advocate for improved parent-school relationships, offer parenting skills training and/or other programs identified as needed or desired by parents and act as a catalyst to help develop adult education programs that could be offered on-site to parents. Centers should be bilingual, where appropriate, and recognize the cultural backgrounds of parents. They should have child

care and provide parents with both necessities (carfare) and amenities (snacks).

In working with at-risk students it becomes particularly important to **strengthen linkages between school and home**. Reaching out to parents becomes essential and one way of providing such linkages might involve employing parents themselves to make home visits and play roles other than that of organizer of the cake sale.

17. Develop and Strengthen Outside Linkages

Schools need to develop and strengthen linkages with business, community-based organizations and other agencies. Yet it is critical that these linkages not be haphazard. There must be a **clear vision** that informs the programs that are ultimately created. Most of all, programs that are developed need to keep the completion of the student's education as their most important priority. School alliances with businesses and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) must ensure that they do not become disincentives for students to complete high school by making work more attractive than school. To help do this, work partnership programs must have a strong monitoring component and re-state their commitment to students completing their education.

Partnerships with businesses and CBOs must also have other kinds of support beyond just jobs built into them (e.g. social service, mentoring, and academic support). These too must be coordinated by full time coordinators and appropriate staff in each school. This is essential if the expectations of all parties (schools, students, parents, business) are to be met and the program is to be successful. Such full-time coordinators and staff must have the support of administration and the programmatic resources to carry out their jobs in the school and in the community.

There needs to be improved coordination and information sharing *within* schools as well as *between* schools. Each school in the system must receive up-to-date information on possible collaborations; partnerships must be established in each school in the most equitable ways. System-wide coordination must also entail evaluation



that leads to continuous improvement of programs and partnerships. Partnerships must be truly collaborative efforts between CBOs and the school system as equal partners in the delivery of services. A case conference approach should be initiated so that delivery can be coordinated and issues of "turf" can be minimized.

18. Expand Special Dropout Prevention Programs

There was a definite recognition of the fact that special programs that offer important services to the most at-risk students (e.g., AIDP, DPP, SSPP and Alternative High School Programs) should be more widespread and their activities disseminated. At present, these programs exist in only a small number of schools.

There is no question that there must be greater follow-through on programs, and that once the State or City makes financial and technical commitments to a program, it must be an ongoing one if the program is to be effective. Communication among the groups involved with at-risk students needs to be improved. **It is recommended that conferences such as this be held on a regular basis to help achieve this.**

Keynote Address

"Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student"

STEPHEN PHILLIPS, Superintendent, Alternative High Schools & Programs
New York City Board of Education

When asked to talk about successful schooling, I was tempted to roll off a list of successful programs. As has already been noted, however, we sometimes get "lost in action", and a longitudinal view of how these programs evolved and some generalizations, if I can be arrogant enough to propose them, about ways beyond this point, might be helpful. At least at the outset, I will be overly simplistic: please don't be insulted if I say very little that is new; I am just trying to provide context.

John Dewey, in *Democracy and Education*, outlines a mini-history of education. Originally, he noted, cavemen educated their young in an apprenticeship system. As domesticity ended nomadic life, early education became the woman's responsibility, until the male youngster reached puberty, and he went off with his father to learn hunting and the rites of man. As society stabilized even more, it developed specialists for education — teachers, who later down the line, opened schools. The wealthier a person was, the more likely that he/she would be sent to school. Only the child not needed at home to herd animals or tend land could be spared.

Education, thus, became an isolated function conducted in special places by special people who were out of the mainstream of working society. Not surprisingly, the norms of these schools, I believe, became very much the norms of those whom Alexander Hamilton referred to as, "...the wealthy, the well-born, and the wise." Importantly, only the student who had emotional and financial support at home could attend school.

Educational historians will realize that I am no longer talking about the caveman: what I'm describing is the educational system in the United States through the early 1970's. In 1918, only 18 percent of the eligible children in the United States were in school; in 1940, only 20 percent of the population could be expected to complete 12th grade. When we first counted drop-outs in New York in 1978, the figure was 54.8 percent. We know who was graduating at each of those dates: the children of the wealthy, well-born, or wise; children who had enough emotional and financial support at home to see them through school.

The early 1970's mark a watershed in American Education, a coalescing of two major upheavals in American society — one of them economic and sociological; the second, largely sociological.

Gordon Berlin, when working for the Ford Foundation, speculated that the enormous economic disasters of the Nixon years — undoubtedly related to Johnson's expenditures during the Viet Nam war — had major impact. Most of us will remember 22 percent inflation and Nixon's wage-and-price freezes, signs of this disaster. More important, however, were the effects on business and industry, which sought to ameliorate the impact of inflation through mechanization, eliminating millions of low-skilled jobs. It began to be difficult to get *any* job without a high school diploma.

Sociologically, the civil rights movement of the 1960's had convinced many people that they had rights to a lot of things — including full education. An incredible expansion of postsecondary education in the 1960's accompanied this trend. The vast expansion of CUNY and SUNY in New York State were paralleled throughout the country, creating a demand for high school diplomas to fill seats at new and expanded colleges.

As a natural outgrowth of both these trends, Americans began to demand that *every child* should earn a high school diploma. While compulsory education had been legislated in New York State — in Massachusetts, in fact, as part of the old "Satan Deluder Laws" in the 1600's — it had never been more than a much-touted ideal. Now, we were expected to make it reality.

One final piece of historical context is needed. At this juncture — the meeting of sociological and economic forces which created enormous demand for high school diplomas — a sort of "reactionarianism" set in, a revolt against the purported liberalism of the 1960's. New York State came late to this revolt — only now implementing the *Regents Action Plan*. When I read the plan, I was struck by the fact that the *Plan* demands — as minimum requirements for any graduate — the exact same requirements demanded of my high school, Oakland High School, for a 1959 "college-preparatory diploma." Clearly, we are now dealing with two movements which, I would suggest, are on a collision course. On the one hand, we're expected to expand high school completion, drawing from castes and classes not typical of the past history of our educational system and, on the other hand, we're witnessing a tightening and rigidifying of education.

Given this history let us look at programmatic attempts to solve the dropout problem.

Educators were quick to seize on the purported lack of "support services" among students as the causal factor in dropping out from school — in fact the term, "support services," entered our vocabulary in the early 1980's. I remember talking with principals who were convinced that adequate health care — dealing with asthma or prenatal care for pregnant girls — could solve educational problems. We hired a plethora of people to provide "support": family paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, school neighborhood workers, social workers; we contracted with CBOs to provide "support". We launched "mentoring"; we established recreational and cultural programs. We did all of this in a rather futile effort to "support" students through an increasingly-rigid schooling, perhaps with a certain amount of cultural condescension, based on the notion that unsuccessful students were "disadvantaged".

I am tempted to use the words "piece by piece" to describe the addition of such services. As money increased, the people increased: bilingual counselors, transition counselors, supportive service counselors, Chapter 1 counselors, DPP counselors, CBO counselors, AIDP counselors, all augmenting traditional tax levy counselors. You may laugh, but it isn't funny: New York City is perhaps the only city in which counselors counsel, deans discipline, grade advisors give academic advice, program committees program. More people; more fragmentation.

Trying to explain this situation to the City Council and Board of Estimate was an interesting task. At first glance, our counselor-to-students ratios are deplorable, at 1:450 or some such astronomical figure. However, the total allocation for what I call "guidance services" — including attendance workers, paraprofessionals, deans, grade advisors, and counselors — the numbers are quite respectable, lying close to one adult per 175 students. A student may see his guidance counselor only once ever six months, but he had also seen the grade advisor four times, the dean a dozen times. The problem, I would suggest, is not a lack of services, rather a lack of holistic responsibility and lack of continuity of service. If counseling is viewed as decision making, I suspect that a youngster needs a counselor to figure out which counselor to go to!

The tentative formative data coming out of recent AI/DP evaluations seems to show that support services, alone, simply don't make a significant difference. When we looked at the 150 AI/DP students targeted in schools, we found attendance didn't improve and credit accumulation didn't improve. The youngster may have been retained on register — which probably wouldn't have been the case five years ago — but he had not improved to the point where anybody could say that he was back on the track to graduation.

The second conclusion coming forth is that, because of the ways programs have been implemented in schools,

no single student has access to the whole array of services available. The person running the jobs program targeted a group of students; the person running the tutoring program targeted a second group; the person running the mentoring program targeted a third group. Whether or not these three programs fell together for any single students in the school was determined by happenstance.

The major flaw in the support services solution to dropping out, however, is that we simply have not impacted enough on instruction. Indeed, this past year, part of somebody's determination was that *none* of the nearly \$30 million allocated for AI/DP in the city could be used for instruction. Net result: student leaves school; support services personnel retrieves him; the school then places him right back in the same program he had left. Collectively, we could guess the reasons for the failure of this approach: a teacher's snide comment ("Uh, glad to see you finally made it back again!"), a school policy that says, "Miss five days, and you flunk," (What good does it do to return after a six-day absence?), a lack of continuity in coursework. How do you get through Sequential Math I if you have missed 25 days? You don't, the way we teach it.

Back to the original point of my context. The instructional pattern we are using today in American schools — not just New York City schools — is one dependent on the 1920's and 1930's-type student, the student who was well-supported at home, came to school 180 days in a row, had a place to do homework. Even the structure of the developmental lesson, which is the norm of instruction across the city, demands verbal, articulate students with excellent listening and participatory skills, to the exclusion of any other activity. The developmental lesson is no longer activity-centered learning; it may have been so in the 1920's, but not today.

What conclusions might I propose to shape our actions in the future? First, we need to view support services and instruction in a cohesive, holistic fashion, and we must lay out an array of options within both halves of this whole. Further, we must figure out some means of organizing various configurations of that array around one student at a time. In some ways, we are already moving in that direction.

The High School Division has taken some promising steps. We are implementing a "house plan" citywide, because it makes eminently-good sense to have a house of 600 students, out of a 2,400-student school, served by its own team of counselors, social workers, and teachers — a team which, hopefully, will discuss among themselves their work with individual students, diminishing fragmentation and building continuity. Alternative high schools have long had models wherein a "family group teacher" or "teacher/advisor" take on an *in loco parentis*

role with students, becoming a referral agent and a single individual to which a single student can go for assistance and guidance. A team approach is one answer; holistic responsibility for a student by one individual is another.

Beyond this, we must re-analyze education to determine what is the *substance* of education, what is the *form*. And, to the extent that the form was developed for an earlier generation of students, of caste and class no longer representative of our total population, the form must change. Do students have to learn material one lesson a day, 180 lessons in a chunk? No, that is *form* not *substance*. Must schooling be limited to 180 days a year, to 5-1/2 hours a day? No, that is *form* not *substance*. Must all material be presented orally by teachers as part of a developmental lesson? No, that is *form* not *substance*. Does it make sense to continue the artificial barrier between "adult education" and "high school"? No, that is *form* not *substance*. In short, we must break out of the form developed in the early years of this century, spread like wildfire across the country, to develop new forms which fit the sociological realities of today's students. I believe that computerization and the High School Division's "Concurrent Options" schools can help to build new *form*, allowing students to pursue learning from 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., for example.

As part of redefining *form*, I would invest some money in the professionalization of teaching. Distressful to the CSA as the United Federation of Teachers' term, "teacher empowerment" may be, the goal is simply to give an adult – the teacher – more responsibility and more voice in determining what happens to the teacher and to the students under their charge. I believe that teachers will be able to negotiate around the system and to help students negotiate around the system if the decision-making process is made more free and more delegated to teachers. Teachers, I believe, will be a great asset in helping individual students find more suitable forms of education.

Support services, too, need not remain as impotent as they are preventing dropping out. Perhaps the most valuable concept evolved in our ten-year romance with support services is that of the "case manager", the person who assists the students in configuring the proper array of support around himself. We must remember, however, that the case manager must not only have at his disposal the array of support services: an instructional array must also be available. Again, both instruction and support must be managed, in tandem, around individual students.

Finally, I would also invest some money in school-based planning, school by school, faculty by faculty, slow, laborious, and tedious as that sounds in a city with 116 high schools, a city in which some people still think that all 116 high schools can be moved, simultaneously, from point to point. Just as individual students have individual

needs and individual developmental schedules, individual schools vary greatly. Institutionally, we must recognize and act upon that reality.

What role might universities and colleges play? Frankly, I am skeptical about some of the approaches used in the past. Single programmatic strands mounted by colleges have, perhaps, only increased the complexities, confusion, and fragmentation I discussed earlier. There is no shortage of collaboration right now, as Ernie Boyer noted in the *New York Times* a short time ago, citing the involvement of postsecondary institutions in New York City's schools as more extensive than anywhere else ever.

But the network of collaboration is a badly constructed network. The mathematics department of a college may be involved with six schools, the education department of the same college with six schools, overlapping, say, in only two of the twelve. The overlapping, furthermore, may be merely the result of coincidence, yielding no combined programmatic result at the high schools. Such programs are *not* school-based, and I am very suspicious of people from colleges when they approach me, saying, "I have a great idea; give me some money, and tell me which schools you want me to work at". I know by definition, that the "great idea" is not school-based.

The most arrogant suggestion made to Chancellor Green since his coming to New York City was made by the president of a major university at a breakfast sponsored by Mayor Koch at Gracie Mansion: "Tell me which are your ten worst schools, and we'll take them over." I lived through one such arrangement in Syracuse, and it had no pervasive, long-lasting impact whatsoever. There is also more than a little audacity in an offer by an institution with a 93 percent drop-out rate to "help" an institution that has knocked 25 percent off its own drop-out rate in ten years – which the New York City schools have done!

The colleges might also help us through advocacy. Though national figures such as Ted Sizer, Ernie Boyer, and Terry Deal have widely discussed the folly of many aspects of the "reform movement," very few local college people, to this day, have gone with us to the State Education Department or to the Board of Regents and said, "Do you folks realize what you are doing?" We badly need that kind of advocacy.

My grandfather used to talk about something called "gut work", a kind of back-wrenching, muscle-tightening work done in not-so-glamorous places. I think we need some gut work from colleges. I believe that fruitful collaboration could come if the entire resources of a postsecondary entity could be targeted to a single school – with the mathematics department, educational administration

program, early childhood education people, English department, in short, the entire college, focused on one school. It's that kind of holistic, on-site gut work that we need.

Part of that collaboration has to be cooperative and collaborative imploding of ideas. Thus far, collaboration has been a one-way street — What can colleges contribute to high schools? May I be bold enough to suggest that we, in public schools, have some things to contribute to colleges!

An accreditation team recently visited a local college, citing the fact that the college faculty spent too much time lecturing instead of providing activity-centered teaching, too little time advising students about the social skills required to succeed in college. A number of our alternative high schools are bottomless wells of experience in redressing those shortfalls and could be of significant help to that college. Likewise, the college could be of signifi-

cant help in upgrading academic levels of instruction in the alternative high schools. Now *THAT* would be true collaboration!

* * * * *

Despite the fact that we have not generated a great deal of positive press coverage, New York City schools have made significant progress toward increasing high school completions. Thousands of students who would have dropped out at any previous time in history have completed high school with solid, marketable skills. The empirical experimentation and research of the past ten years places us, I believe, at the forefront of knowledge about what works, what does not work and — most important about what *should* work. With the help of our friends, the progress will continue.

Program

Wednesday, June 1, 1988

12:00-1:00
REGISTRATION

1:00-1:30
WELCOMES

Norman Shapiro, City College
Leonard Beckum, City College
Charles Graber, SED

1:30-2:30
SSPP PROJECT DIRECTORS SHARE PROJECT
ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Mary Amuge, Chair/timekeeper

2:30-3:30
ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

Task: Each of the areas below undoubtedly poses some problems for all of our SSPP projects. Select one of these areas and identify specific problems or difficulties projects are having. For each problem identified, develop a set of possible solutions. Identify any areas where technical assistance could be beneficial.

- Evaluation
- Parent Involvement

- Institutionalization
- Impact on At-Risk Students
- Impact on Schools
- School/University Relationships

3:45-4:45
PRESENTATION:
"THE CHANGE PROCESS AT THE UNIVERSITY"
Toby Tetenbaum and Tom Mulkeen,
Fordham University
Discussants:
John Devine, N.Y.U.
Bill Godfrey, Stony Brook

4:45-5:30
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Task: Identify the changes that need to be made at our universities that could directly or indirectly improve schooling for the at-risk students we are mandated to serve. Identify ways of overcoming the institutional barriers to change

5:30-6:30
POSTER SESSION BY GRADUATE STUDENTS

Thursday, June 2, 1988

8:00-9:00
REGISTRATION

9:00-10:15
OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Welcomes and Conference Overview
Norman Shapiro, City College
Leonard Beckum, City College

Rebecca Kennard, NYSED, Conference Chair
Mike Van Ryn, NYSED

Keynote Address: "Successful Schooling for the At-Risk Student"
Stephen Phillips, Superintendent of Alternative
High Schools & Programs, New York City
Board of Education

10:30-12:00

STRAND WORKSHOPS

Better schooling for at-risk students through:

1. Enhanced parent involvement

Facilitator:

John Devine, New York University SSPP

Presenters:

Janet Wagner, Fordham SSPP

Joe Elias, New York City Board of Education, City College SSPP

Roxia Bullock, Taft High School DPP

Pat Hall, Region 2 Headstart, AIDP

2. Changes in curriculum and instruction

Facilitator:

Cynthia Onore, City College SSPP

Presenters:

Nancy Lester, City College SSPP

Larry Finkel, College of New Rochelle SSPP

June Feder, Lafayette High School AIDP

3. Staff development/teacher empowerment

Facilitator:

Hilda Gore, New York City Board of Education DPP

Presenters:

Judy Tarlo, John Jay High School DPP

Nancy Mohr, University Heights, AHSP

4. Improved school organizations and services

Facilitator:

Linda Sarnoff, New York City Board of Education, Alternative High School & Programs

Presenters:

Rosemarie Arons, Bronx Regional High School AIDP

Stan Feingold, Brandeis High School DPP

Kurt Paul, Prospect Heights High School NYU SSPP

5. Enhanced self-esteem and school climate (1)

Facilitator:

Eleanor Edelstein, New York City Board of Education AIDP

Presenters:

John Stokes, Lynn Passy, Kenn Mann, Lillian Bascone, Pace University SSPP

Robert Scherma, Christopher Columbus High School AIDP

Diane Marcucci, SUNY Buffalo SSPP

Jean Gilbert & Leon Lomonaco, Brooklyn College SSPP

6. Enhanced self-esteem and school climate (2)

Facilitator:

Ian Evans, SUNY Binghamton SSPP

Presenters:

Alean Rush, Nazareth College SSPP

Betsy Rulon and Caesar Previdi, Martin Luther King High School DPP

John Maynard and Gail Verdi, New York University SSPP

12:15-1:30

LUNCH

Greetings:

Bernard Wolinez, Chief Administrator, Office of High School Support Services, (AIDP)

Marcia Shelton-Brevot, Superintendent, Alternative High School & Programs

1:30-3:00

STRAND WORKSHOPS

1. Enhanced parent involvement

Facilitator:

John Devine, New York University SSPP

Presenters:

Margaret Kimbel, Brandeis High School DPP

Brumsic Brandon III, New York University SSPP

Allison Alden, Mary Chenecka and Brenda Brown, SUNY-Binghamton SSPP

Madeline Lumachi, Brooklyn College Academy AHSP

2. Change in curriculum and instruction

Facilitator:

Cynthia Onore, City College SSPP

Presenters:

Fred Banyon, Franklin K. Lane High School AIDP

Mike Wilson, SUNY-Buffalo SSPP

Ted Otis, New York City Central Park Historical Society, NYU SSPP

Alan Lentin, Satellite Academy AHSP

3. Staff development/teacher empowerment

Facilitator:

Hilda Gore, New York City Board of Education, DDP

Presenters:

Steve Applebaum, New York City Board of Education, NYU SSPP

Stan Dubin, Roosevelt High School DPP

Larry Finkel, College of New Rochelle SSPP

Norman Shapiro, City College SSPP

4. Improved school organization and services

Facilitator:

Linda Sarnoff, New York City Board of Education, Alternative High Schools & Programs

Presenters:

Ian Evans and Adria DiBenedetto, SUNY Binghamton SSPP

Yvette Villegas, DPP

Ed Reynolds, West Side High School AHSP

Grace DiRiggi, Brentwood Schools

SUNY-Stony Brook SSPP

5. Enhanced self-esteem and school climate

Facilitator:

Eleanor Edelstein, New York City Board of Education AIDP

Presenters:

Charlene Sherling, Judith Bode and Eileen Davidson, SUNY Binghamton SSPP

Robert Maher, Cornwall High School AIDP

Pamela Moore, Victims Services Agency, DPP

Marc Weiss, Bronx Regional High School AHSP

6. Partnerships with businesses and CBOs

Facilitator:

Warren Crichlow, Nazareth College SSPP

Presenters

Taraja Samuel, New York City Board of Education, Office of School & Business Linkages

Nat Belpedio, Bushwick High School DPP

Diane Reiser, Erasmus Hall High School AIDP

3:15-4:45

CONCLUDING PLENARY SESSION -

Strand facilitators bring recommendations generated in strand workshops to a panel of educational leaders for their comments.

Charles Graber, NYSED, Chair

Panelists include: Regent Norma Gluck, School Superintendents Victor Herbert and Marcia Shelton-Brevot, Bernard Wolinez

Concluding comments:

Rebecca Kennard, Conference Chair

Conference Participants

Stay in School Partnership Program

Alden, Allisony	DiBenedetto, Adria	Ollivierre, Jeanne
Alvarado, Rosa	Dichter, Alan	Onore, Cynthia
Amuge, Mary	Elias, Joseph	Paul, Kurt
Applebaum, Steve	Espina, Julie	Peltzer, Rhoda
Baratta, Anthony	Evans, Ean M.	Porveccia, Loreta
Bascone, Lillian	Faber, A.	Pozzuto, Libera
Bazigos, Michael	Finkel, Larry	Rivera, Lawrence
Beckum, Leonard	Fogelman, Betsy	Rush, Alean
Bishop, Carole	Gilbert, Jean	Schrenzel, Jeff
Bodge, Judy	Godfrey, Bill	Shapiro, Norman
Brandon, Brumsic III	Graber, Charles	Shaw, Heather
Brown, Brenda	Guglielmotti, Luisa	Sherling, Charlene H.
Brown, Margery	Huntley, Dawn	Stevens, Michael
Chapman, Sandra	Kimble, Margaret	Stokes, John
Chenecka, Mary	Kennard, Rebecca	Van Ryn, Mike
Cicchelli, Terry	Kriola-Ryan, K.	Verdi, Gail
Cole, Annette	Lester, Nancy	Wamba, Nathalis
Conelli, Anthony	Lindsay, Arturo	Whinery, Linda
Crichlow, Warren	LoMonaco, Leon	Wilson, Mike
Davison, Eileen	Lynch, Claudine	Zochlea, Pauline
Devine, John	Mann, Kenn	
	Baynard, John	

Alternative High Schools Program

Lentin, Alan	Rekosh, Lois	Shelton-Brevot, Marcia
Lumachi, Madeline	Reynolds, Ed	Weiss, Marc
Mohr, Nancy	Sarnoff, Linda	

Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention

Alston, Jessica
Arons, Rosemarie
Banyon, Francine
Bassell, Estelle
Black, Suzanne
Cetta, Michael
Cohen, Peter
DeRiggi, Grace
Dworkin, Elly
Edelstein, Eleanor
Eisenberg, Lew
Feder, June
Fenster, S.

Fitzgerald, Irene
Forman, John
Freedman, Marion
Garrett, C.
Giglio, Terry
Graber, Brenda
Hall, Patricia
Hauptman, Barry
Indik, Philip
Lam, Daniel
Levy, Ted
Loscalzo, Natalie
Maher, Robert
Marks, N.S.

Matthes, Harold
Milo, G.
Meyer, Wilma
Miraglia, John
Poindexter, Shirley
Reiser, Diane
Samuels, Elenor
Schaeffer, Madalyn
Skolky, Barry
Steinfeld, Elaine
Seif, Judith
Velmachos, Noreen
Wolinez, Bernard

Drop-Out Prevention Program

Belpedio, Nat
Bullock, Roxia
Dubin, Stanley
Fallick, Sheila
Feingold, Stanley
Gore, Hilda
Heitmann, Barbara

LaBosco, Louis
Levyne, Herman
Moore, Pam
Narvaez, Sara
Papalberios, Elena
Pena, Antonio
Previdi, Ceaser

Rulon, Betsy
Tarlo, Judy
Villegas, Yvette
Wichern, Jerry
Wince, Robert
Winum, Paul
Wyatt, Alphonso

Others

Altahe, Ruth
Anderson, M.
Barett, Ethlyn
Brunkhorst, Linda
DeSilva, Michele
Fracentise, Anthony
Gluck, Norma
Grano, Oivia
Grant, Y.C.

Haim, David
Kennedy, Ed
Lindsay, Debra
McDonagh, James
Mulkeen, Tom
Murdaugh, Carolyn Y.
O'Mara, Maureen
Pascale, Isabel
Samuel Taraga

Shapiro, Ileana
Shockley, Alonzo Hilton
Siveron, George
Dixilian, Jr., Joe
Sikorski, Rita
Singleton, Will
Tetenbaum, Toby
Waford, Shirley

Acknowledgments

Many individuals contributed to making this Conference possible. We would like to thank them for the time and energy they devoted.

Conference Planning Committee

Warren Crichlow	Rhoda Peltzer
Betsy Fogelman	Rebecca Kennard
Bill Godfrey	Norman Shapiro

Strand Leaders

Warren Crichlow	Hilda Gore
John Devine	Cynthia Onore
Eleanor Edelstein	Linda Sarnoff
Ian Evans	

New York State Education Department Office of Higher and Continuing Education Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration

Charles Graber
Rebecca Kennard
Mary Amuge

Heads of Participating Programs

Margretta Fairweather
Victor Herbert
Marcia Shelton-Brevot
Bernard Wolinez

City College Staff

Norman Shapiro
Betsy Fogelman
Rhoda Peltzer
Genevieve Singh
Denmattie Samaroo